

## GO DARD VS. GODARD

Upon superficial examination, the films of Jean-Luc Godard divide themselves into two camps: the pre-1968 films dealing with the self-investigation of Godard the artist and cineaste and the post-1968 films concerned with the self-investigation of Godard the aesthetic politico. In reality, his film work (both written and filmed criticism) has developed in four symphonic movements: during which various facets of his consciousness (artistic and political) vie to perform the lead melody. In the first section, Godard's work as a practicing critic for Cahiers du Cinema, the film "buff" within him prevails. During the second period, his films up to LE GAI SAVOIR (1968), the fan within him is present, but muted by his continuing desire to critisize the medium. From LE GAI SAVOIR to VLADIMIR ET ROSA (1970), his third period according to my schema, the somewhat muted enthusiasm for narrative film he possessed before is now mercilessly throttled and Godard practically destroys the cinema as we had come to know it. To complete the admittedly tenuous metaphor, we must finally consider his fourth and current movement, the shakiest and least certain of them all; with TOUT VA BIEN (1972) and its dialectic cousin LETTER TO JANE (1972) each member of the orchestra of his conscious plays the central theme with equal ferocity.

Throughout this 25 year public inquiry into the nature of film, Godard has been plagued with a proclivity for self-analysis that at some points has become self-destructive. It is my aim in the present paper to investigate these two elements of the same propensity within Godard's work by examining a text from each of the categories I somewhat arbitrarily created above. As an example of Godard's written criticism I have chosen an article on Hitchcock's THE WRONG MAN (1956) published in June 1957 in Cahiers, both for its exemplary quality and the presence of Henry Fonda as the star of the film. VIVRE SA VIE (1962) will serve as an example of Godard's narrative cinema, LE GAI SAVOIR (1968) illustrates his non-narrative side (though in

actuality it is more of a transition piece) and TOUT VA BIEN and LETTER TO JANE will, in conclusion, provide us with samples of the widely divergent character of Godard's present inclinations.

In studying these five works I intend to pay particular attention to his attitude toward the image and itscorrelatives, editing and camera movement. Additionally and unavoidably, I must consider the presence or absence of narrative (or narratives) and its effect upon the work. I remain skeptical that Godard's ouvre will enact a straight line development with regard to any of these elements of filmmaking, but I feel it worthwhile to attempt to chart the ebb and flow of Godard's filmic concepts. Hopefully this may be accomplished without succumbing to the riptide that his often confusing eclecticism sometimes engenders.

At the time Godard wrote his article on THE WRONG MAN he had been publishing criticism for seven years, beginning with his own journal, La Gazette du Cinema, in 1950 and joining Cahiers du Cinema in 1952. During that time Godard and other French critics sparked a still expanding interest in heretofore intellectually abused American directors such as Nicholas Ray, Alfred Hitchcock and Samuel Fuller, to name but a few. As with most nascent polemics, les politiques des auteurs was presented with a verve and temerity which encouraged overstatement and indeed, Godard's comments of this time are often of dubious value. He wrote on Ingmar Bergman's SUMMER INTERLUDE (1951):

To say of them [outstanding films], "It is the most beautiful of films", is to say everything. Why? Because it just is. Only the cinema can permit this sort of childish reasoning without pretending shame. Why? Because it is the cinema. And because the cinema is sufficient unto itself.<sup>1</sup>

However, in the case of the WRONG MAN article, he is singularly articulate about the values of the film. His interest at this point is the evocative and entrapping value of the image. To quote him at length:

Even more than a moral lesson, THE WRONG MAN is a lesson in mise-en-scene every foot of the way. In the example I have just cited [the line-up sequence], Hitchcock was able to assemble the equivalent of several close-ups in a single shot, giving them a force they would not have had individually. Above all -- and this is the important thing -- he did it deliberately and at precisely the right moment. When necessary, he will also do the reverse, using a series of rapid close-ups as the equivalent of a master shot. Hitchcock makes us experience the taking of fingerprints -- that mark of shame, once burned into the accused's flesh by an executioner with a red-hot iron -- with terrible immediacy. Thumb, index, second finger inked, the policeman's face, Fonda dazed, distortion of the wrist as the fingers are pressed on the card, the shots overlapping each other because they are cut exclusively with the movement, in a rapid frenzied montage reminiscent of MR. ARKADIN.<sup>2</sup>

It is clear that, for Godard, the essential greatness of Hitchcock is his ability to draw the spectator into the scene, to encourage the spectator to

identify with the character. It is also clear that this concept of filmmaking directly contradicts the Brechtian mode of theater of which Godard will become so enamored of: just a decade after he wrote the above, Godard will be unable to erase Brecht's name from a blackboard (in *LA CHINOISE*).

If we accept Louis Althusser's definition of Brecht's principal aim ("to produce a critique of the spontaneous ideology in which men live."<sup>3</sup>) most of Godard's early criticism is lacking in Brechtian thought. However, Godard was concerned with the criticism of art, if not ideology. His concern is manifested most obviously in his articles, but it also surfaces in what he expects a film to do. He writes of Howard Hawks in 1952:

From the art of ONLY ANGELS HAVE WINGS to that of HIS GIRL FRIDAY, THE BIG SLEEP and indeed, of TO HAVE AND HAVE NOT, what does one see? An increasingly precise taste for analysis, above for this artificial grandeur connected to movements of the eyes, to a way of walking, in short, a greater awareness than anyone else of what cinema can glory in, and a refusal to profit from this (...) to create anti-cinema, but instead, through a more rigorous knowledge of its limits, fixing its basic laws.<sup>4</sup>

And, later, on Jean Renoir:

And if ELENA ET LES HOMMES is "the" French film par excellence, it is because it is the most intelligent of films. Art and theory of art, at one and the same time; beauty and the secret of beauty; cinema and apologia for cinema.<sup>5</sup>

Finally, on Anthony Mann in 1959:

With Anthony Mann, each shot comprises both analysis and synthesis, or as Luc Moullet noted, both the instinctive and the premeditated.<sup>6</sup>

These are filmmakers admired by Godard because, among other things, their work enacts a self-analysis. Whether it produces a "critique of the spontaneous ideology in which men live" was a question peripheral to Godard's <sup>immersed</sup> sphere of interest at that point in time. He <sup>immersed</sup> himself joyfully in the image and, most enjoyably, in analysis of the image by the image.

As encoded with the "ruling ideology" as these images are, Godard can still write of some particular close-ups in THE WRONG MAN thus:

The beauty of each of these close-ups, with their searching attention to the passage of time, comes from the sense that necessity is intruding on triviality, essence on existence.<sup>7</sup>

His loving appraisal of the use of Henry Fonda's face is far removed from references he will make to it in analyzing Fonda's daughter's face in LETTER TO BANE. In the latter film, Henry Fonda's facial expression is explained in terms of Roosevelt's New Deal; the beauty of its image is summarily bypassed.

Outside of the somewhat obvious contradictions elucidated above between Godard's early and late thought, the WRONG MAN article contains certain earmarks of his cinematographic style. For example, one may trace fairly directly some of the cornerstones of Godard's editing techniques. In the first quote from his writing above, he speaks of the superiority of cutting "exclusively with the movement, in a rapid frenzied montage reminiscent of MR. ARKADIN." According to Godard, speaking in 1967, he began using this technique in BREATHLESS and has been using it systematically ever since. In his words:

...when you edit on the basis of what's in the image and on that basis only...not in terms of what it signifies but what signifies it, then you've got to start with the instant the person or thing in motion is hidden or else runs into another and cut to the next shot there.<sup>8</sup>

Additionally, in complimenting Hawks' attention to eye movements, Godard presages his tendency to edit on a glance -- a concept which peaked in VIVRE SA VIE. With the formation of the Dziga Vertov Collective Godard would drop these techniques -- along with most editing techniques -- until VLADIMIR AND ROSA.

In addition to his formal concerns, Godard spent much of his Cahiers'

ink discussing the narrative and its construction in terms of "classic" films. Still fond of Dreyer, Eisenstein, Renoir, Welles, Griffith, etc., he hadn't yet come to feel, "there is no such thing as classical cinema. There is only capitalist cinema and revolutionary cinema."<sup>9</sup> Or even begun to consider which one of those cinemas was preferable. In 1959 he wrote that content precedes and conditions form, but he hadn't yet begun to detest the often melodramatic content of films by persons such as the "future admiral of honor of the navy, John Ford" (LETTER TO JANE). Indeed, to honor films of the American cinema as the Cahiers group did meant a willingness to overlook certain elements of what has been called a "preventive charity" invented by the bourgeoisie to calm the masses<sup>10</sup>, i.e., melodrama. Though his pre-1968 films critique melodramatic moments of earlier films, he still entrusts his movies with instances of melodrama. Beginning with LE GAI SAVOIR, Godard disavowes almost any form of narrative as bourgeois and consequently purges his work of it to the greatest degree possible.

When Godard moved into the active process of creating feature length films in 1959 it was little surprise that his films themselves enacted a criticism of the medium. Begining with BREATHLESS and concluding temporarily with WEEKEND he produced narrative films which were their own critique. Following that (LE GAI SAVOIR onward) he produced mostly non-narrative films which concentrated on critiquing ideologies -- often to the denigration of his earlier, aesthetic critiques. If I may be allowed one more generalization, it seems that from 1959 to 1968 his films <sup>depended</sup> explored the consciousness of the artist while the 1968 to 1972 movies concentrated on the consciousness of the society that spawned them.

VIVRE SA VIE typifies Godard in the former, aesthetic period described above. The film is swollen with ~~men~~ narratives (see Susan Sontag), the images are well composed (though Godard says this was by accident), the cutting is rapid and innovative and the camera movements are unlike any in the history of cinema. For these reasons, and others, I have chosen to dissect VIVRE SA VIE in some depth.

The most outstanding feature of VIVRE SA VIE's narrative structure is its division into twelve tableaux. According to Godard, by dividing the film thus he intended to:

emphasize the theatrical, Brechtian side. I wanted to show the "Adventures of Nana So-and-so" side of it. The end of the film is very theatrical too: the final tableaux had to be even more so than the rest.<sup>11</sup>

Godard also creates Brechtian distance through a style of cutting that disrupts the normal narrative film continuum and the use of full frontal close-ups of Nana which make us frighteningly conscious of our position as moviegoers. This distance destroys the impact that the <sup>a</sup> theater (melodrama) of the final tableaux would have <sup>in</sup> a film by Nicholas Ray, for example. In a sense, then, it is the begining of Godard's denial of his previous

affection for theater in film. However, in this early manifestation of Godard's <sup>V</sup>denigration of melodrama he falters and the intensity of the sequence draws us into the drama despite the Brechtian devices. We "feel" for Nana though we have repeatedly been shown that she is total artifice. Godard clings to his security blanket of melodrama and doesn't release it until LE GAI SAVOIR.

Though Godard does minimal damage to the narrative in VIVRE SA VIE, his hatred of moving pictures (and consequently, his self-hatred) that will do such violence to the image in PRAVDA and WIND FROM THE EAST remains merely potential at this stage. VIVRE SA VIE is a film rich in imagery, as are all his films <sup>UN</sup>til LE GAI SAVOIR. In fact, as Marie-Claire Ropars-Wuilleumier points out;

By cutting out all transitions and explanations, Godard is able to bring the audience's eyes and its attention back to the image itself, which he preserves in a kind of pristine state by divorcing it from the role of intermediary it usually plays vis-a-vis the succession of shots.<sup>12</sup>

Which is to say, the exclusion of frivolous transitions shots forces one to consider the images as the primary subject of importance. Cutting a pan into five jerky, smaller pans, as Godard does in VIVRE SA VIE, actually empowers the image beyond its normal capabilities. Though it might appear that Godard is slaughtering the image in this instance, he is actually glorifying it by coercing the spectator to concentrate on the image instead of the plot or the characters. Ironically, the character who has been machine gunned in the street in the above sequence stumbles into the cafe screaming, "my eyes, my eyes!" An exclamation many an unprepared viewer of VIVRE SA VIE has been <sup>o</sup>want to cry out.

As further substantiation of what Godard would later consider the repulsive, bourgeois nature of the images of VIVRE SA VIE is the manner

Godard regarded the creation of those images. As he said in an interview in 1962, he had simply to "pull out" the shots from the "bottom of a well" -- a metaphor oddly similar to the Dziga Vertov Collective's description of bourgeois filmmakers "fetching" images ("la chasse aux images"<sup>13</sup>). In 1968 - 1972 Godard and Jean-Pierre Gorin attempted to build very simple, desaturated images and subsequently analyze them. In 1962, Godard was satisfied to acquire images from the bottom of a well, images soaked (forgive my pun) with references to other images, images produced by Raoul Coutard, a man Godard later described as having a "reactionary mind"<sup>14</sup>. (Obviously VIVRE SA VIE is far from the zero point of images Godard will later seek.)

Furthermore, the complexity of the images is compounded by the movement of the camera. Realizing this, Godard later preferred a motionless camera, set on a tripod:

For the moment we [the Dziga Vertov Collective] prefer to work with steady shots, just to reduce things to more simplicity.<sup>15</sup>

Afterall, a moving camera creates a new frame twenty-four times each second and the camera of VIVRE SA VIE is often in motion. In fact, Godard's films through WEEKEND (especially WEEKEND) contain a multitude of curious tracks and pans. It isn't until around 1968 that Godard's camera is brought suddenly to a halt with still photos. True, Godard uses still photos, posters and titles in the earliest of his films, but they were never the main concern. VIVRE SA VIE is no exception; its repeated use of titles to announce each of the sections obstructs the flow of the film at key moments, but they are distant from the constant use of stills in LETTER TO JANE or even LE GAI SAVOIR. Only the foolish or young of heart would dare posit a precise meaning for all the camera movements in VIVRE SA VIE, but

it is safe to say these movements, often disassociated with the action, commonly critique traditional camera style. Take for example, the first sequence of the film in which the camera tracks back and forth from Nana to Paul in a cafe. Ignoring possibilities for "shot/reaction shot" camerawork this track calmly moves from one character to the other and back: an image layered with meanings which suggests~~s~~much, but resists the type of analysis in which Godard will later engage. Which is to say, Godard's cryptic tracking shots in VIVRE SA VIE bring to consciousness and thereby critique both Howard Hawks and Max Ophuls, but they bear little <sup>ci</sup>weight with regard to Czechoslovakia (PRAVDA), the Chicago Eight trial (VLADIMIR AND ROSA) or even 1960s France (LE GAI SAVOIR).

If one were to designate a cinematic metaphor for LE GAI SAVOIR, it would have to be the dissolve. Just as the dissolve is a transition in which one image waxes as another one wanes, LE GAI SAVOIR is a transition film in which Godard's aesthetic concerns begin to fade at the same time his political interests become more visible. Conveniently, the film was created during a period of great transition in that it was shot before May <sup>and</sup> of 1968 (December 1967), but edited later, during that May ~~the~~ the June thereafter. How could it help but embody the mixed impulses of that chaotic era?

Of the cinematic elements we have been considering to this point (narrative, the image, editing and movement), each one is diminished to considerable degree in LE GAI SAVOIR; but none of them are completely eliminated. The one to fair the worst from this diminishment would have to be the practically non-existent <sup>arr</sup> narrative, but, indeed, even that facet of the cinematic language is not wholly irradicated. At the conclusion of WEEKEND, the film immediately preceding LE GAI SAVOIR, Godard proclaimed "The End of Cinema" and toward that goal he removed any intrigue or drama from LE GAI SAVOIR, but he did retain certain accouterments of drama. Which is to say the film still has characters (though they are distanced from the spectator in the best Brechtian tradition) and a sense of temporal progression (they greet and introduced each other at the outset and bid each other adieu at the "denouement"). The obvious obstructions to the narrative (in the form of black leader, still photos, titles, models for other films, etc.) evidence Godard's growing dislike of the medium as it has evolved, but this dislike is still restrained and the remnants of traditional narrative film persist.

Similarly, seemingly mortal blows are dealt the image which, upon closer examination, does not sustain as much damage as might be supposed. Godard's

*14*  
major weapon in his assault on the image, black leader, is utilized with considerable violence in LE GAI SAVOIR, but its impact is weakened by the setting in which the characters conduct their conversation. The inexpressive set of a darkened TV studio (Brecht would be proud, Hermann Warm would cry) resembles black leader in itself and thereby lessens the shock that a black screen in a film by Sam Fuller, for example, might elicit. From LE GAI SAVOIR to TOUT VA BIEN, <sup>G</sup> Godard will disturb us again and again with the total darkness of black frames, but in the instance of LE GAI SAVOIR the blackness irritates one less than the still images which demand one's attention.

Additionally, it doesn't appear to me that Godard's use of black leader is actually the destructive force that some critics suggest. Given that blackness is the absence of light and by definition the absence of image in the cinema, the blackness also encourages thought of images of the world outside the movie theater. When Juliette Berto shuts her eyes and thereby simulates black leader in real life (in the frame of the film), she states, "If you want to see the world, close your eyes." Godard confirms this concept of viewing the world via the removal of images by inserting shots of the world congruent with Berto closing her <sup>within</sup> ~~eyes~~ <sup>ey</sup> ~~ey~~ <sup>cl</sup> eyes. When Godard ~~chooses~~ the spectator's "eyes" by forcing Black leader upon him he tells him on the soundtrack of the images the spectator is missing: "This is a picture of a ~~young~~ girl in a bikini, but we can't show it because it belongs to CBS," and then "Another picture we don't have the right to see because it has been sold [to western imperialists]," both from PRAVDA. Just as the radicals in VLADIMIR AND ROSA force the TV cameras to film Bobby X's absence, Godard is impelling us to consider the absence of the real world through his use of black <sup>h9</sup> images. They have become not the absence of images

but instead the presence of a different sort of image, a true image of the world around us and therefore an impossible image to convey in the scope of filmmaking. In VLADIMIR AND ROSA, Godard speaks of black images: "It finally has meaning, we used to think they were shots that belonged to CBS, now we know they are shots we can't shoot."

Though one may theorize of the "supra-image" character of the absence of traditional image in Godard's films from LE GAI SAVOIR to LETTER TO JANE, one must still admit that they ~~renounce~~ Godard's earlier infatuation with the image as exemplified in the WRONG MAN artical examined above.

Another example of his growing <sup>fg</sup> distaste for the images in films such as THE WRONG MAN is his startling insertion of received images such as photographs, TV images, etc. Not only are these images immobile, bereft both of camera movement and movement within the frame, but they are not even created by the auteur <sup>of</sup> the film. As with the usage of black leader, Godard has brought foreign and, in the case of the received images, uncinematic images into the film and thereby challenges the right of the film to create artifice. However, we have already noted that Godard could not bring himself to eliminate the narrative and, true to form, he cannot yet dispatch all elements of the cinematic image. For though a sizeable amount of it is comprised of the "fetched" images Godard would later deride -- by this I mean the images of Leaud and Berto that make up the majority of the film. Photographed in the dark and with few camera movements, the image of them in the studio is greatly simplified, but it is not yet devoid of beauty. The colors are bright and vivid, the lighting shifts around continually and the frame, though barren, is more than once visually engaging, not to mention the <sup>physical</sup> attractiveness Juliette Berto and Jean-Pierre Leaud bring to the screen. The mise-en-scene of LE GAI SAVOIR breaks dramatically

with that of WEEKEND and before, but it is not yet the poor quality color and jumping frame shots of PRAVDA or the total use of still photographs in LETTER TO JANE.

TOUT VA BIEN returned to the type of cinema Godard produced in 1966 and 1967 (DEUX OU TROIS CHOSES, LA CHINOISE, WEEKEND), however, the years had wrought some changes. He soon produced LETTER TO JANE and it became apparent that TOUT VA BIEN was only the narrative ("A tale for the foolish one who still needs one."<sup>16</sup>) portion of what would develop to be one of the most mixed years of Godard's career. Though TOUT VA BIEN bore all the elements of Godard's pre-LE GAI SAVOIR films, LETTER TO JANE ravaged traditional narrative cinema as he had never before dared.

With TOUT VA BIEN Godard continued to delve into the problems of ideology, but he no longer feared discussing these problems with the aid of, to his mind, bourgeois images. His response to the question of an American college student illuminates his position:

If you have your film processed by Technicolor, a capitalist firm, it's necessarily a bourgeois film, isn't it?  
Godard: No, not at all. Because you can have a gun, an M-17 and you can shoot Nixon with it. And it will not be a bourgeois bullet any more.<sup>17</sup>

Godard has chosen to assault the prevailing bourgeois ideology with what he considered images encoded with just that ideology. In form, TOUT VA BIEN closely resembles the images of VIVRE SA VIE and similar works and, in content, it differs little from that of LA CHINOISE, WEEKEND or DEUX OU TROIS CHOSES; substantial instances of black leader are noticeably absent while long tracking shots heedless of the action abound. Godard's ideological concerns are now couched in aesthetic terms. For example, Susan Alexander fights with her husband not because he produces capitalist commercials (though that is a small portion of it), but because she cannot conceive an image of him at work. The image she can conjure, a woman's hand on a cock, does not suffice now that the events of May 1968 have <sup>ou</sup> <sup>fiz</sup> sensitized her ideological awareness. She, as with Godard, searches for

aesthetic confirmation of her political convictions.

LETTER TO JANE moves in the opposite direction. The first cinematic sin, among many, the film commits would have to be the total lack of motion. Once or twice one photograph is slid across the frame revealing another photograph in an operation similar to a wipe, but little movement exists beyond that. The 1958 Godard wrote about one instance of lack of movement in this manner:

Classical dance, which seeks the immobility in movement, is by definition the opposite of cinema. The aim of each step, each arm movement, each spring, each leap, is to achieve a sculptural pose: which is far removed, obviously from the concerns of the Lumiere Brothers.<sup>18</sup>

By commanding us to study a still image, LETTER TO JANE violates this basic tenant of mobility. The glances that Godard so enjoyed cutting upon have been frozen into stares. The pleasures of the tracking shots of Max Ophuls are lost on the Godard of LETTER TO JANE. In similar fashion, the film rejects the use of narrative, traditional montage, actors, or even expressive sound and thereby removes itself from the scope of cinema. Contradicting his films prior to LE GAI SAVOIR, ~~TOUT VA BIEN~~ and his critical writings, he states in LETTER TO JANE, "we must discuss the film from outside the film."

Evidently Godard intended to construct a dialectic whole by producing both synthesis (~~TOUT VA BIEN~~) and analysis (LETTER TO JANE) within the same year. LETTER TO JANE, however, strikes me more as an admission of failure on the part of Godard: why does he feel it necessary to critisize from without? Previously he had stridgently maintained that the best films are their own critique. Producing a critique of his film from outside the realm of the film proper is tantamount to writing an explanation of a painting or a novel to accompany that work. What puzzles me most is the

essentially superfluous nature of LETTER TO JANE; TOUT VA BIEN is sufficient unto itself.

In sum, the year of 1972 encapsulates many of the contradictory impulses of Godard, but primarily, it illustrates how love of the image and an urge for destruction of that same image can exist within the consciousness of a single filmmaker. Which impulse will ascend in the years to come rests in Godard's hands.

## FOOTNOTES

<sup>1</sup> Godard on Godard, ed. Jean Narboni and Tom Milne, (The Viking Press: New York), pp. 75 - 76.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid., p. 50.

<sup>3</sup> For Marx, Louis Althusser, (Penguin: New York), p. 144.

<sup>4</sup> Op. cit., Narboni and Milne, pp. 29 - 30.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid., p. 63.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid., p. 120.

<sup>7</sup> Ibid., p. 49.

<sup>8</sup> "Struggle on Two Fronts: A Conversation with Jean-Luc Godard", Film Quarterly, vol. 22, p. 22.

<sup>9</sup> "Double Feature", Michael Goodwin, Take One, vol. 2, #10, p. 16.

<sup>10</sup> Op. cit., Althusser, p. 139.

<sup>11</sup> Op. cit., Narboni and Milne, p. 187.

<sup>12</sup> Focus on Godard, ed. Royal S. Brown, (Prentice-Hall, Inc.: Englewood Cliffs, N.J.), p. 92.

<sup>13</sup> "Godard and the Dziga Vertov Group: Film and Dialectics", Film Quarterly, vol. 26, #1, pp. 34.

<sup>14</sup> Op. cit., Goodwin, p. 16.

<sup>15</sup> Ibid., p. 16.

<sup>16</sup> A title at the conclusion of TOUS VA BIEN.

<sup>17</sup> Op. cit., Goodwin, p. 22.

<sup>18</sup> Op. cit., Narboni and Milne, p. 87.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Althusser, Louis, For Marx, (Penguin; New York, 1968).

Focus on Godard, ed. Royal S. Brown, (Prentice-Hall, Inc.: Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1972).

Godard on Godard: Critical Writings by Jean-Luc Godard, ed. Jean Narboni and Tom Milne, (The Viking Press; New York, 1972).

Godard, Jean-Luc, Weekend and Wind from the East, (Simon and Schuster: New York, 1972).

Godard, Jean-Luc, Letter to Jane, trans. Aimee Grunberger and Robert Piret.

Goodwin, Michael, "Double Feature", Take One, vol. 2, #10.

McBean, James Roy, "Godard and the Dziga Vertov Group: Film and Dialectics", Film Quarterly, vol. 26, #1.

"Struggle on Two Fronts: A Conversation with Jean-Luc Godard", Film Quarterly, vol. 22.

### Principal Films Considered:

Vivre Sa Vie (My Life to Live, It's My Life), (1962) dir. and script. by Jean-Luc Godard, photog. Raoul Coutard, starring Anna Karina, Sady Rebbot and Brice Parain.

Le Gai Savoir (Merry Wisdom, Happy Knowledge, others), (1967-'68) dir. and script. by Jean-Luc Godard, photog. Georges Leclerc, starring Jean-Pierre Leaud and Juliette Berto.

Tout Va Bien, (1972), dir. and script. by Jean-Luc Godard and Jean-Pierre Gorin, photog. Armand Marco, starring Jane Fonda, Yves Montand and Vittorio Caprioli.

Letter to Jane, (1972), conceived by Jean-Luc Godard and Jean-Pierre Gorin, starring and in-focus, militant actress and two blurry revolutionaries (or is it the other way around?).